

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-10, 12 and 14-42 were pending. Claims 2, 4, 16-17 and 19-22 are withdrawn from consideration. Through this reply, claims 43-50 are added. Claims 1 and 30 are independent.

§ 103 REJECTION – YAMAGUCHI, IWASHITA, VOCKENHUBER, ISHIKAWA

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 7, 9-10, 12, 14-15, 18, 23-26, 28 and 39-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamaguchi (translation of JP 64-007792) in view of Iwashita et al. (U.S. Patent 4,427,280), Vockenhuber (U.S. Patent 4,148,072) and Ishikawa et al. (U.S. Patent 6,549,650). *See Office Action, pages 3-16.* Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1 recites, in part “wherein ... said first image-capturing unit comprising ... an interface for transmitting data between the first image-capturing unit and the second image-capturing unit, wherein the interface can also accommodate writing and reading data to and from an external storage device detachably connected to the electronic camera when the image-capturing apparatus is not in a multi-lens camera mode.” None of the

cited references Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockenhuber and Ishikawa teaches or suggests this feature. For at least this reason, independent claim 1 is distinguishable over the combination of Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockenhuber and Ishikawa.

Claims 3, 5-6, 7, 9-10, 12, 14-15, 18, 23-26, 28 and 39-40 depend from independent claim 1 directly or indirectly. Then, for at least the reasons stated with respect to independent claim 1, these dependent claims are distinguishable over the combination of Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockenhuber and Ishikawa.

It should be noted that the dependent claims are also distinguishable on their own merit. For example, claim 10 recites, in part “an AE device ... separate from the AE device of the first image-capturing unit”, “an AWB device ... separate from the AWB device of the first image-capturing unit” and “an AF device ... separate from the AF device of the first image-capturing unit.” In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges Ishikawa teaches the second image-capturing unit that includes at least one of AF, AE and AWB devices. The Examiner specifically refers to the signal processing unit 95 as illustrated in Figure 14 of Ishikawa. Ishikawa states “the unit 95 performs calculations for AF (auto-focusing) and AE (auto-exposure) and white-balance adjustment. See *Ishikawa*, column 20, lines 6-8.

However, the signal processing unit 95 is a single device performing the functions for both image sensing devices 92a and 92b allegedly equivalent to the first and second image-capturing units as recited. Note that there are no separate signal processing units for each of the image sensing devices 92a and 92b. Thus, Ishikawa cannot teach or suggest the features as recited in claim 10. Indeed, Ishikawa actually teaches away from the features as recited.

As another example, claim 12 recites, in part “wherein each of the first and second image-capturing optical systems comprises a non-contact communication device for transmitting information between the first image-capturing unit and the second image-capturing unit by using electromagnetic waves including image data from the second image-capturing unit to the first image-capturing unit.” The Examiner relies upon Vockenhuber to allegedly teach a wireless communication between a movie camera 1 and a TV camera 4. However, Vockenhuber at best teaches that object angle setting information i.e. information to control the operations of the cameras, may be transmitted wirelessly. There is no disclosure that the actual image data are transmitted from one camera to the other.

For at least the above-stated reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-6, 7, 9-10, 12, 14-15, 18, 23-26, 28 and 39-40 based on Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockehuber and Ishikawa be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – YAMAGUCHI, IWASHITA, VOCKENHUBER, ISHIKAWA,
KANEKO

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockenhuber and Ishikawa and in further view of Kaneko (U.S. Patent 4,920,371). *See Office Action, page 17.* Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 8 depends from independent claim 1 and it is amply demonstrated above that claim 1 is distinguishable over the combination of Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockenhuber and Ishikawa. Kaneko is not relied upon to correct for above-noted deficiencies of the cited references. Therefore, claim 1 is distinguishable over the combination of Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockenhuber, Ishikawa and Kaneko. Then, for at least due to the dependency thereon, claim 8 is also distinguishable over the combination of Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockenhuber, Ishikawa and Kaneko.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 8 based on Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockenhuber, Ishikawa and Kaneko be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – YAMAGUCHI, IWASHITA, VOCKENHUBER, ISHIKAWA,
FELLAGARA

Claims 27 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockenhuber and Ishikawa and in further view of Fellagara (U.S. Patent 6,441,854). *See Office Action, page 18-20.* Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 27 and 29 depend from independent claim 1 and it is amply demonstrated above that claim 1 is distinguishable over the combination of Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockenhuber and Ishikawa. Kaneko is not relied upon to correct for above-noted deficiencies of the cited references. Therefore, claim 1 is distinguishable over the combination of Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockenhuber, Ishikawa and Kaneko. Then, for at least due to the dependency thereon, claims 27 and 29 are also distinguishable over the combination of Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockenhuber, Ishikawa and Fellagara.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 27 and 29 based on Yamaguchi, Iwashita, Vockenhuber, Ishikawa and Fellagara be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – YAMAGUCHI, ISHIKAWA

Claims 30-35, 37 and 41-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamaguchi in view of Ishikawa. *See Office Action, pages 20-27.* Applicants respectfully traverse.

Again, independent claim 30 recites, in part “a first connecting part that mechanically and directly connects to a second connecting part of the second image-capturing unit so as to form a single unit, wherein the first connecting part is such that an external storage device can be detachably connected to the first image-capturing unit when the second image-capturing unit is not connected to the first image-capturing unit.” Neither Yamaguchi nor Ishikawa teaches or suggest this feature. Then for at least this reason, independent claim 30 is distinguishable over the combination of Yamaguchi and Ishikawa.

Claims 31-35, 37 and 41-42 depend from independent claim 30 directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least due to the dependency thereon, these dependent claims are also distinguishable over the combination of Yamaguchi and Ishikawa.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 30-35, 37 and 41-42 based on Yamaguchi and Ishikawa be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – YAMAGUCHI, ISHIKAWA, FELLAGARA

Claims 36 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamaguchi and Ishikawa in further view of Fellagara. See Office Action, pages 27-29. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 36 and 38 depend from independent claim 30 and it is demonstrated above that claim 30 is distinguishable over the combination of Yamaguchi and Ishikawa. Fellagara is not relied upon to correct for at least the above-noted deficiencies of Yamaguchi and Ishikawa. Therefore, independent claim 30 is distinguishable over the combination of Yamaguchi, Ishikawa and Fellagara. Then, for at least due to the dependency thereon, claims 36 and 38 are also distinguishable over Yamaguchi, Ishikawa, and Fellagara.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 36 and 38 based on Yamaguchi, Ishikawa and Fellagara be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 43-50 are added through this reply. All new claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited references, individually or in any combination. Applicants respectfully request that the new claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION


All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

By: 
Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No. 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant


MRC/HNS:sld